

**EPA PROJECT OFFICER POST-AWARD EVALUATION PROTOCOL**  
**CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM OFFICE (CBPO)**

<b>MID YEAR/SIX MONTH:</b> <u>  X  </u> <b>CLOSEOUT:</b> <u>      </u>	<b>GRANT NUMBER(s):</b> 96317101	
<b>1. DATE PREPARED:</b> 12/12/14	<b>2. RECIPIENT NAME:</b> PA Department of Environmental Protection	
<b>3. ENTER ALL DATES:</b>  <b>a. OFF-SITE CONFERENCE CALL DATE:</b> 12/12/14  <b>b. ON-SITE REVIEW DATE:</b> (enter date if applicable, otherwise N/A)  <b>c. REPORT DATE:</b> 12/12/14 (Date Report Sent by Email to Grantee)  <b>d. CLOSED DATE:</b> 12/12/14 (Date all major issues resolved, if applicable, otherwise this date is same as Report Date.)	<b>4. PROJECT OFFICER(s): PARTICIPANTS/PERSONS CONTACTED:</b> (Names /Affiliations)  -EPA: Tim Roberts (PO)  - GRANTEE: Steve Taglang, Dave Lewis	
<b>5. <u>AWARD INFORMATION</u></b>  Grant <u>  X  </u>  Cooperative Agreement <u>      </u>	<b>6. <u>PROJECT / BUDGET PERIOD DATES:</u></b>	
	<b>BEGINNING</b>	<b>ENDING</b>
	Project Period: 11/1/2012	12/31/2017
	Budget Period: 11/1/2012	12/31/2017
<b>7. <u>AWARD AMOUNT</u></b>  EPA share: \$8,083,836  Recipient share/Match: \$8,083,918  EPA IN-KIND: \$100,000  Total: \$16,367,836	<b>8. <u>BRIEF PROJECT DESCRIPTION:</u></b>  This grant agreement aids the recipient in providing project activities designed to reduce nutrient and sediment loads that cause or contribute to the impairment of water quality standards in the Chesapeake Bay and its tidal tributaries. This work will help to achieve and maintain the water quality necessary to improve the aquatic system health of the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem.	

**9. Is the payment history consistent with progress to date?**

Response: Yes.

**10. Is the work under the agreement on schedule?**

Response: Yes.

**11. Is the actual work being performed within the scope of the recipient's workplan?**

Response: Yes.

**12. Are the recipient's staff and facilities appropriate to handle the work under the agreement?**

Response: Yes.

**13. Are the products/progress reports submitted on time?**

Response: Generally. The last progress report required an extension, which the PO accepted. The delay was due to time being consumed with PA preparing their 2014 grant application in September 2014.

**14. Are the products/progress reports acceptable?**

Response: Yes.

**15. Is the recipient making adequate progress in achieving outcomes and outputs and associated milestones in the assistance agreement workplan?**

Response: Yes.

**16. If the recipient is experiencing significant problems meeting agreed-upon outcomes and outputs, has the recipient been required to develop and implement a corrective action plan?**

Response: N/A

**17. Has the recipient complied with the programmatic terms and conditions on the award? (e.g., QMP, Program Income, etc...)**

Response: Yes.

**18. Did the recipient purchase equipment/property as planned in the agreement?**

Response: Yes.

**19. Has the equipment been used as planned in the agreement?**

Response: Yes.

**20. Does this review indicate any reason to amend the award?**

Response: No. Recipient amended work plan as part of 2014 incremental funding application, which addressed ULOs and improved work outputs.

**21. If this award includes sub-awards, is the recipient complying with the sub-award policy requirements?**

Response: Yes.

**22. Is there anything else the project officer wishes to share? (e.g., Findings, Needed actions, Requested documentation, etc...)**

Response: This award has had ULO issues, but recipient made significant changes to work plan in FY14 which addresses this issue. Recipient's expenditure rate should improve in FY15.